

VZCZCXYZ0005
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #1179/01 3521803
ZNY SSSSS ZZH
O 181803Z DEC 09
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0739
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/VCJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHEHNSC/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 5809
RHMFISS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUESDT/DTRA-OSSES DARMSTADT GE IMMEDIATE
RUENAAA/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DIRSSP WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
INFO RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA PRIORITY 2988
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV PRIORITY 1998
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY 7205

S E C R E T GENEVA 001179

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24
CIA FOR WINPAC
JCS FOR J5/DDGSA
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR
NSC FOR LOOK
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 12/17/2019
TAGS: [KACT](#) [MARR](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [RS](#) [US](#) [START](#)
SUBJECT: START FOLLOW-ON NEGOTIATIONS, GENEVA
(SFO-GVA-VII): (U) NOTIFICATIONS WORKING GROUP, DECEMBER
10, 2009

REF: GENEVA XXXXX (SFO-GVA-VII-097)

Classified By: A/S Rose E. Gottemoeller, United States
START Negotiator. Reasons: 1.4(b) and (d).

¶1. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VII-121.

¶2. (U) Meeting Date: December 10, 2009
Time: 3:30 P.M. - 5:00 P.M.
Place: U.S. Mission, Geneva

SUMMARY

¶3. (S) During a meeting of the Notifications Working Group, held at the U.S. Mission on December 10, 2009, the sides discussed notifications that could be removed or combined. Mr. Siemon and Mr. Smirnov discussed the U.S.-proposed joint draft text for Section I, General Provisions, and tentatively agreed on that text. The sides also discussed Section V, Conversion or Elimination Notifications, in detail. The remaining substantive difference for Section V concerned where information regarding notifications of a change in database information would be placed in the text. The meeting closed with a discussion of the remaining sections of the document (Sections II, III, IV, VI and VII) in addition to the agenda for a future meeting. End Summary.

¶4. (U) SUBJECT SUMMARY: Removing Formats; Sections I - General Provisions; Section V - Conversion or Elimination; The Future.

REMOVING FORMATS

¶5. (S) Siemon began the meeting by stating the U.S. delegation had agreed to remove and combine additional notifications from the U.S.-proposed Part Four to the Protocol, Notifications. He stated START Format 10, Notification of Planned Numbers of Nuclear Warheads on Deployed Systems, START Format 11, Notification of Planned Aggregate Numbers, START Format 12, Notification of Expected Numbers of Deployed Arms in Excess of Planned Numbers, and START Format 15, Notification of Transfer of Items to and From a Third State, could be captured under a Format 3 (change in Database Information) in the case of 10, 11, and 12, and in the case of Format 15, could be captured under a generic "additional messages" notification. Smirnov noted that the Russian proposal was not to eliminate Format 15 but to include that data transfer in a more common format. Siemon stated the United States would review that proposal.

¶6. (S) Siemon addressed Russia's previous proposal to remove Format 68 (Ref A), Notification of Annual Schedule for Conversion and Elimination, by stating that the U.S. side was not prepared to remove this notification at this time. He stated it was important for proper planning of resources and it could be very useful depending on the outcome of the inspection quota discussion. Smirnov opined that information received on an annual basis was not accurate and that a Notification of Intent to Eliminate or Convert, transmitted

30 days prior to the start of elimination procedures, would provide enough time for any necessary planning. Siemon stated he would engage the U.S. delegation again regarding this issue.

SECTION I - GENERAL PROVISIONS

¶7. (S) Siemon opened discussion on Section I by noting that three of the four paragraphs in the new U.S.-proposed joint draft text were based on Russian-proposed text.

Begin text:

¶1. The Parties hereby agree upon provisions that establish the procedures for, and the content of, the notifications provided for in Article VIII of the Treaty.

¶2. A data base pertaining to the obligations under this Treaty is set forth in Part Two of the Protocol to the Treaty, in which data with respect to items subject to the limitations provided for in this Treaty are listed according to categories of data.

¶3. Each Party shall provide to the other party notifications concerning: 1) data contained in Part Two of the Protocol to the Treaty and other agreed categories of data; 2) movement of items subject to the treaty; 3) flight tests and telemetric information of ICBMs or SLBMs; 4) conversion or elimination of items and facilities and removal from accountability of items and facilities; 5) Inspections and Exhibitions; and 6) additional messages relating to the Treaty.

¶4. If a time is to be specified in a notification provided pursuant to this Part, that time shall be expressed in Greenwich Mean Time. If a date is to be specified in a notification, that date shall be specified as the 24 hour period that corresponds to the date in local time, expressed in Greenwich Mean Time.

End text.

Smirnov immediately agreed with the paragraphs. Siemon

stated the fourth paragraph was a statement providing the reader an understanding of what would be discussed in the document and in what order. Smirnov asked whether the intention was simply to list the sections in this paragraph, and Siemon replied that was the intention with the added hope of keeping consistency with other documents. Smirnov agreed in principle and stated the Russian side would review the new paragraph in detail.

¶8. (S) Siemon noted that the U.S. side would provide a joint draft text, in both Russian and English, for Section II, Notifications Concerning Data with Respect to Limitations Provided for in the Treaty, prior to the next meeting. He stressed that it was important to provide more clarity, especially with the use of Format 3, Change in Database Information. Added clarity would allow an easy transition from this text to the specific formats in the Notifications Annex to the Protocol. He provided a rough idea of what the

Russian side could expect to see in that document and added he hoped to have joint draft text from the Russian side by Friday afternoon.

SECTION V - CONVERSION OR ELIMINATION

¶9. (S) Siemon shifted the discussion to Section V, Conversion or Elimination (CorE), of the new U.S.-proposed joint draft text. Smirnov reviewed the text briefly and stated the Russian side had no concerns with sub-paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b) related to Notifications of Intent and Notifications of Initiation. He agreed those were both in the Russian-proposed text and noted only minor differences in the language. He stated that the Russian side was now willing to accept the U.S. proposal in sub-paragraph 1(c), to include a notification for "Readiness to Inspect." He noted the previous Russian proposal was to include such data in a Format 3, Change in Database Data.

¶10. (S) Smirnov questioned the use of a notification following the completion of CorE activities in the U.S.-proposed text. LT Sicks replied that the notification would be a Format 3 as proposed by the Russian side. Smirnov then stated that paragraph 2, which required a notification of change in database information in the case of removal by other means (i.e., accidental loss, disablement, etc.), was already covered in Section II of the text. Sicks replied that the Russian-proposed text provided only a note referencing the requirement and that more specificity and clarity was needed. Smirnov agreed but noted that the Russian side wanted to minimize the number of required notification formats used. He stated the notifications in paragraph 2 should all use a Format 3 notification. Siemon reiterated that Sicks' earlier point concerning clarity was important and that both the U.S. Senate ratifiers and future implementers on both sides needed to understand what specific notifications were covered under Format 3. Siemon told Smirnov that both sides were in agreement and that the real issue was one of format, not substance.

THE FUTURE

¶11. (S) Siemon provided assurance of U.S. flexibility regarding the format and location of items in the text, and he reiterated that clarity was more important than format location. Smirnov then proposed to focus on Section III, Notifications Concerning Movement of Items, Section IV, Notifications Concerning Flight Tests, and Section VII, Notifications of "Additional Messages" in the next meeting. (Begin comment: Section VII would include all notifications not specifically covered under Sections II through VI. End comment.) Both he and Col Petrov opined Section VI, Notifications Concerning Inspections and Exhibitions, would be extremely difficult and recommended addressing it after

the Inspection Protocol Working Group (IPWG) had finalized more text. Siemon agreed.

¶12. (S) Siemon asked Smirnov to deliver the U.S.-proposed definition of "Declared Data" to Amb Kunetsev, and he

recommended discussing it at the next Definitions Subgroup meeting. On notifications, Siemon noted the United States would be prepared to discuss Section II, Section III, and Section IV during the next working group meeting. He stated there was a significant amount of bracketed text in Section VII and major issues would need to be solved before progress could be made on that section. Siemon did, however, agree to the need for a free text, "catch-all" format that would be located in Section VII. Smirnov stated he understood and would be ready to meet again Saturday.

¶13. (U) Documents provided:

- UNITED STATES

-- U.S.-Proposed Joint Draft Text, Sections I and V of Part Four of the Protocol to the Treaty, dated December 10, 2009; and

-- U.S.-Proposed text for the Definition of "Declared Data," dated December 10, 2009.

¶14. (U) Participants:

UNITED STATES

Mr. Siemon
Mr. Dwyer
LT Sicks
Mr. French (Int)

RUSSIA

Mr. Smirnov
Col Petrov
Mr. Voloskov
Ms. Komshilova (Int)

¶15. (U) Gottemoeller sends.
GRIFFITHS